

being no longer in existence, it was necessary to alter its features to the usages of Free Masonry, but if we no longer profess to fight physically against Infidels, we are taught to contend against infidelity—is not this a sufficient “raison d’être?” Are there no poor and destitute in the land, no friendly sympathy to be manifested, requiring the aid of the good Samaritan to assist the aged, the widow, and the orphan of our deceased Brotherhood? Are the principles of the Christian religion as taught in the orders of chivalry so opposed to those of the Craft that it is necessary to change its whole character to make it acceptable? I think not. Brethren, let us increase our charity and limit our display, then Free Masonry and Chivalry will unite together, in doing good to others.

The Christian faith was essential to Chivalry, and there is abundant evidence to show the religion of Chivalry was a religion of motives and of the heart. The quaint old writer “Favin,” in his “Theatre d’honneur et de Chevalerie,”* first enjoins: “The fear, honour, and service of God, to contend with all strength for the Faith, and rather suffer a thousand deaths than renounce Christianity. Then, to support justice, to attend to the proper complaints of the weak, especially widows, orphans, and demoiselles, and, when necessary, to fight for the right and common cause.”

Fratres! I cannot do better than recommend for your perusal, “The Broad Stone of Honour; or, the true sense and practice of Chivalry,”* to convince you that Chivalry and Free Masonry can work together in unison, and that it was totally unnecessary to take from the Templar Order its Chivalric character to make it acceptable to the *universal Masonic doctrine*.

The Order does not occupy, historically, a position analogous to the Craft, nor has the same fusion taken place with it and Free Masonry in the British Dominions as in the United States. We view the United Orders of the Temple and Hospital as Chivalric, and only to be looked upon as Masonry in order to secure protection of the legal statutes, which enables Masonry, under proper restrictions, to meet with closed doors. In fact, in strictness, we should begin our ceremonies by opening a Master Masons Lodge and a Royal Arch Chapter, then a Preceptory, since in the eye of the law we only meet as Masons. Masons are, or may be, Templars, but the qualification has only a legal object, therefore the apron is now repudiated—if we wear one, it should be that of a Master Mason;

*By Kenelin Henry Digby, Esq., London; Edward Lumley, Chancery Lane, 1843. Vide also “History of Chivalry and the Crusades,” by the Rev. Henry Stebbing, M. A., M. R. S. L.; Edinburgh Constable, 1830.